5/7/68

Dear Paul, your May 7 analysis of the FBI's reporting of Oswald's activities is brilliant, particularly becuse it depends so much on reasoning and you are so remote from the sources of hidden information. My I , in this context, review what I asked you to tell me about and that you referred to Hal, from whom I am anxious to hear. Why I have to be so circumspect will have tow await my next trip out there, but please believe me, there is gound for thebelief that the New Orleans operation was massive and involved a large number of different and unusual types, some of whom I now know ami cannot disclose. No matter how tiny the shred, how picayune the trifle in this directi , please let me have it.

There are a few minor suggestions I make for your thinking.

With N) T 6, why not consider the last possibility, knowledge or presumed knowledge of Oswald or a false one, and that the informant could have been female, and not necessarily the kind of female an agent would call a woman. Possibly a girl, for example. There was a young female informatant. I cannot say she was NO T 6. And, is my recollection wrong in telling me that one, perhaps this one, passed in public transportation. Unfortunately, I've not had time to read O IN NO since publication, and when I glance at parts I find rather heavy and unwise chopping, like with the camp and the Miami tape. But this is my recollection.

Should you ever redo this memo, I suggest strengthening the second para - graph, for the reality is more imporbable: that every left-winger asrested by the police ask to be interviewed by the FBI.

In fixing on Kasck and deBrueys, I believe you have fastened on two of the more important. Recall my handling of Kasck in O IN NO. And deBrueys with Pena. I have since learned more about deBrueys. There was an inner office at the CRC or the Frente, which Pena uses indistinguishably, or the more general term, "the organization". And those select few who entered it for private conversations were deBrueys, Ferrie, Arcacha, Bartes and many others. I have one long interview with him transcribed and now corrected. I expect to hand it to Jim this weekend or to take it with me. Ask Tom to send you a copy and tell him it is with my permission. I'll be there to confirm it. Let me tell you, in confidence, that Tom is a bitter disappointment to me because he is so incredibly lazy. He gets in 1);30-11, leaves not later than 5, and seems to do nothing after hours. It is simply because there is no one doing this work that I must go there, and someone living there would have an enormous advantage. If I ask him to send it to you, eh do what he always has, tell me to Xerox it myself, and I just cannot go down there, put in the hours I do, and then spend the time at a Xerox machine. If there is a single thing that he has or has come accross that would help in the work that I am doing for that office, he has not once vilunteered it-ever. However, there had to be reason for a number of the strange things that happened, aside from this, involving deBrueys. Why did he so lose his cool and threaten Pena, especially because Pena was his informant. Of course, to say that Pena told him of pro-Castros is to say nothing because there were none and there never was and is not now an kind of pro-Castro organization or activity. I cannot even find an active pro-Castro person to help me, though I did locate a 6--year old Spanish war veteren, who confirms the above-and has done nothing and come up with nobody. Pena also complained to the FBI and hired a lawyer to do it, so gross was the abuse. Possibly this complaint was enough to trigger deB., nothing else needed. However, I regard it as rather unusual for an experienced FBI agent to threaten physical violence. Therefore, it is likely what Pena said or what he knows, in my opinion. He is now uncertain of the time. I believe he originally told me it was after his testimony. I think I have learned some of what Pena knows that the Feebees do not want known (when I use this term it will be in the sense some of my witnesses use it, all federals or federals whose origin is not certain. There is something new I have learned, and that is payroll distinctions are not definitive. I know now of employees serving as many as three agencies, sometimes simultaneously. I cannot reveal more about this.

Nor, much as I'd like to, can I use as public a medium or the time to give you the detail of what I've learned. In summary, it is this: all those bastards down their lied or were carefully led awa from reality and essence by Liebeler, who knew precisely what he was doing. From what is public let me illustrate this, because it is important for you tomunderstand it and also important that I withhold my other proofs: He has said, publicly, that the Commission knew (a popular evasion for the first person with him) that the CRC was getting CIA money and the Ferrie was connected with it. This is not in anything you can get in the archives, is not the proper subject of the suppressed Ferrie reports, in part, and there is nothing in any of the evidence about it. But he did know it, and in more detail. I have him saying it, on tape. Oswald, or "Oswald", was at Pena's at least three times and on the last occasion was not drunk! One of Pena's employees saw him regularly at another place in that block early in the morning, in the company with a Mexican not of Dean Andrews' description. His conversation(s) with Bringuier were other than Bringuier represented and where Bringuier did not. I have an "eyeball" witness, and on tape. Two efforts were made to shoot or intimidate Evaristo Rodriguez, and other successful intimidations were employed. However, I found him suffering from the mumps, befriended him, earned his confidence, and turned him on. He still held out and I didn't take him as far as I ultimately expect to. I stayed away from things I knew he'd likely get his back up about. I've also interviewed barmaids with knowledge (but not of English!) and from a combination of people I learned some of what the now-dead Armanda knew, which was so much more than I've learned. Bringuier lied rather celeberly to the Commission and Liebeler, who must have known better, let him get away with it. He lied to the FBI, they lied about what he said, or both. If you compare Philip Geraci's testimony with Bringuier's, here alone, on the number and times of visits, you can see it. However, they had a longer and closer relationship, as , among other things, reports I now have prove. Including Secret Service, and there is a receipt Philip signed in June, not August 2. This is quite significance, believe me, and anything you have, suspect or deduce along this line would be interesting to me. Philip is very important. Fascinating story-really incredible. He had a number of associates, many now known to me, and had a strange history, no less so since. He was suddenly drafted, after I got on the track of something, although he was and should have been permanent 4F (psycho-and what a history!). He is getting special military treatment.

I wonder so, for the pressure of time is that great on this.

In your third paragraph, why not add the Kaack and deBrueys omissions and ask yourself if this culd not be because a Feebee had it under observation, that Kaack knew why it should not be reported and deBrueys did not amke a simple oversight. Would deBrueys have said he saw it without explaining why he was there, or that Kaack did, without drawing attention to the oversight, or that a CIA man known to him did. Or a CIA contact agency (their distinction is between employed by and working for. Ferrie was in the latter category, on 60-day contracts, thus eliminating the need for, among other things, security checks.). However, I am not inclined to think that any federal agency would have been there in observation of alleft-wing activity except by accident. I am more than ever convinced this was part of the establishment of an intelligence cover and many people knew it. Skip in your thinking to the correct enomolies you so perceptively spot in Quiroga and Bringuier, to which I shall return. Does this also not make sense of the omissions cited in your next paragraph.

With regard to the fourth paragraph, I've not been able to look into Core. There was a tight ring of friendships and homosexuality in the old Trade Mart. I have no doubt whatsoever of Shaw's CIA connections. That os others in his circle is not unlikely, directly or through him.

Your question at the end of the next paragraph, top page two, is my belief, and I can get lots of hints but no proof.

Quoroga and Bringuier are among the most professional liars you will

encounter. Let me tell you that Quiroga was not alone when he went to Oswald's, and that Bringuier has misrepresented his relations with everyone in his part of the story that Liebeler did not suppress. Why, indeed, did the FBI have no interest? Only because it did not have to. By then they knew the nature of the operation, the one thing that makes sense of the demand for an FBI agent. Who was he going to ask for- the CIA? Does it not make sense that Quiroga was out looking for what he found the first time? And does it make sense that Bringuier would not go the second time if it is principle that sent him the first? To think that Bringuier would voluntarily miss this is not to know or understand him at all.

P2, #4. Do you not regard 12 days as an inordinately long time to order further investigations of a defector to the USSR engaged in such activity as this one seems to have been? Remember, Oswald told them he wanted to return, in the official accounting, because he was disenchanted. Remember what the Mertello report says he said? Fain's?. In N.O. "Cuban activities" and relate to the only kind there were, anti-Castro. Banister is an unlikely candidate, unless he were part of the establishment of the cover. There is every reason to presume he did know Oswald or "Oswald". Here note that there is a difference between not knowing and not knowing of. It is unlikely that any one knowing anything at all about Cuban activities or any kind by that date did not know of Oswald.

Bartes was CIA, may still be, right now considers himself under their proection and is explicit about it. I believe it. He told me. He casts himself and clothes himself like a Jame Bond type, even to the trench coat when it is not raining. He flew planes in the Congo in 1965. Need any more? He is a Catholic-Royalist-fascist type, serious in these beliefs. I suggest that these less-than-minimal Bartes and similar reports were designed so that there could always be an affirmative answer to the question, had he(they)been interviewed and the reply eh (they knew nothing; want the report? One obvious reason the FBI had to ask Bartes anout Oswald is Ol's use of the 544 address, which is most likely either a nasty whimsy or a deliberete design, to attract opponents to the less than tender mercies of those anti-Castros. ...Whoever wrote the (you should remember, <u>edited</u> report)that is CD984h, knew better on all counts.

In your last paragraph, you understanding will be increased if you substotute Liebeler for Commission, for that is the reality, and if you credit my assurance, that he damned well knew what he was doing. Another change that will helf is the substitution of "federal" for FBI. The CIA operation there is enormous, with limitless financing and a magnificent cover, now penetrated (I bow). There was oberlapping with at least Treasury, wto I am certain of is customs and narcotics. Immigration, without doubt.

Paul, you are going the right way. Now you know why I asked Hal, as soon as I returned from New Orleans the first time, to have you people concentrate on the Cuban end. Thenit was hunch. Now it is certainty. I regret that I cannot tell you more, but I have given my word and I cannot and will not in any way jeopardize my sources, which are mine alone and separated to the degree I can from others-all.

However, I am going to ask a great favor of you. I have been so involved with so many and some other things that I had completely forgotten the printed sources you cite. Also, I'd like a copy of the TIMES clipping on the CRC for my files. Please Xerox all the documents you cite in this memo. I already must carry more than I canx and I haven't the time now. Further, please cut them apart by sheet and staple them together, each as an individual document. If this does not overburden you, please do the same thing with the Bringuier testimony and dehibits and that of Ceraci and Blalock. I will want them to show witnesses. I haven't the time now and should not take it there. I expect to spend less time in the office, because I waste too much time there. In addition to the new and vital fisld, I have a very considerable backlog on other aspects when I am there, and I want to do all I can. This time going is an ever greater burden. I do not yet knowxwhere I will

stay. The office is so broke they haven't paid the motel about $1,000, so they cannot put me up there. I can probably find space in a private home, but that will take time, and part of the time I will require public accomodations because of what I will be doing. I am having to pay my own fare, too, and I've just not got the money. I do not even have enough to pay upcoming obligations. But this I must do, as you will ultimately learn. Worst of all, the lack of security in the office is so great I can tell but little there, and none of consequence to Jim or the lawyers. Only the outline. One of the great worries is that the successful whores on our side will steal this, too, and with the by now too obvious unscrupulousness jeopardize everything, including the lives of people who are helping. As it is I am thorcughly bugged and shadowed. Let me tell you a fantastic story about this: I arranged for two of Jim's men to meet me at the motel so I could introduce a witness to them. This was on Good Friday, when everything there is closed. The official shadowing report located, it says, two other Garrison men there at the same time, unknown to me or the two who joined me!

This financial situation makes me bitter about things that need not have happened and should not, for example, the failure of the Forum to pay my guaranteed 1966 expenses. Hall has been silent since my rather pointed comment on this. He is the only one with whom I want you to share what I have said here, and I want neiher of you to let it go forthur. Please needle him about this for me. There is no possible excuse or justification for this continued imposition on me or on their imposition on Hal's word and integrity.

My present schedule it Minneapolis 5/14 am until 16 p.m., with Gary Schoener, Kansas City 16 p.m. until 17 a.m., with John Nichols (grand guy, magnificent work), thence New Orleans. I'll be there through the day of 28, may stay longer while I am down there if I have the money and can use the time on a holiday weekend. I must be back before 6/4 and in time to get all the backlog cleaned up bythen. I have given Mark half of a three-hour TV show I had lined up and a warmed-up audience that I've appeared before for 18hours. How it will go will depend on him. But if you want to know how it can go, when you see his new book, read the part about Klein's on page 14, study the footnote carefully (what he means but doesn't say is Dec 87 -there is no index) and then tell me where this has ever appeared save in Chapter 6 of WWII. He steals even when it isn't necessary. However, you can send anything to me c/o Louis Ivon, marked to hold for arrival. He will and it will be more secure there. I do hope you can Xerox these things for me. If you can think of anything else you'd like an inside source to go over, please include it with any note for me you think appropriate.

One thing before I apologize for now not having the time to read this for typos (by now Hall should be able to anticipate them, with the great knowledge he has of my original spelling and awful typing), from time to time I have been saying that Liebeler is the most important thing of all. More then ever, I so assure you. Please, every scrap on him, every suspicion, every evidence. And there is nothing too minor about New Orleans, Cubans, the CIA, etc. Sincerely,